R E P O R T R E S U M E S

ED 016 759 UD 005 530

IRCD BULLETIN, VOLUME 3, NUMBER 5, NOVEMBER 1967.

BY- GORDON, EDMUND W., ED.
YESHIVA UNIV., NEW YORK, N.Y., ERIC CLEARINGHOUSE

PUB DATE NOV 67

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.25 HC-$0.32 6P.

DESCRIPTORS- *SCHOOL SURVEYS, *SCHOOL SEGREGATION, *ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT, *MINORITY GROUPS, *EDUCATIONAL QUALITY, COMPENSATORY EDUCATION, EQUAL EDUCATION, NEGRO STUDENTS, CAUCASIAN STUDENTS, TEACHER CHARACTERISTICS, STUDENT CHARACTERISTICS, RACIAL COMPOSITION, SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT, EDUCATIONAL FACILITIES, EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES, COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT, BIBLIOGRAPHIES, ENVIRONMENTAL CONTROL (PSYCHOLOGICAL)

FEATURED IN THIS BULLETIN IS A DISCUSSION BY EDMUND W. GORDON OF "EQUALITY OF EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY" (KNOWN AS THE COLEMAN REPORT AFTER ITS SENIOR AUTHOR), A REPORT OF AN EXTENSIVE SURVEY OF MINORITY GROUP EDUCATION IN THE UNITED STATES. AFTER EXAMINING SOME OF THE DATA AND FINDINGS IN THE REPORT, GORDON CONCLUDES THAT ONE CANNOT ON THE BASIS OF THE REPORT'S STATISTICS INFER THE CAUSES OF THE CONDITIONS WHICH COLEMAN DESCRIBES. HE MAINTAINS, HOWEVER, THAT ONE CAN SAFELY ACCEPT COLEMAN'S CONCLUSION THAT MOST MINORITY GROUP CHILDREN ATTEND SCHOOLS WHICH ARE ETHNICALLY AND SOCIALLY SEGREGATED. MOREOVER, AS COLEMAN SUGGESTS, MINORITY GROUP CHILDREN ARE STRONGLY INFLUENCED BY THE QUALITY OF THEIR TEACHERS, BY THE CURRICULUM, AND BY OTHER PUPILS IN THE SCHOOL. THESE SCHOOL FACTORS ESPECIALLY INFLUENCE PUPILS' SENSE OF CONTROL OVER THEIR OWN DESTINY, WHICH IN TURN AFFECTS THEIR ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT. HOWEVER THE COLEMAN REPORT DOES NOT RECOGNIZE THE IMPACT OF THE DISADVANTAGED CHILD'S EDUCATIONAL DEFICIT UPON HIS SUBSEQUENT ACHIEVEMENT, FOR IT FAILS TO CONSIDER THAT SCHOOLS SHOULD BE PROVIDING UNEQUAL, COMPENSATORY TREATMENT FOR THE DISADVANTAGED. THE STUDY ALSO DOES NOT ASSESS SUCH SUBTLE BUT IMPORTANT "PROCESS VARIABLES" AS CLASSROOM CLIMATE, PUPIL-TEACHER INTERACTION, OR THE NATURE AND QUALITY OF SCHOOL ADMINISTRATION. HOWEVER, ALTHOUGH THE STUDY ONLY CRUDELY IDENTIFIES AND MEASURES SCHOOL FACTORS, IT CLEARLY INDICATES THE IMPORTANCE OF SCHOOL INTEGRATION AND IMPROVED SCHOOL QUALITY, AND DOES NOT CONTRADICT THE SUGGESTION THAT THE COMMUNITY PARTICIPATE MORE IN SCHOOL POLICY MAKING. A BIBLIOGRAPHY ON THE COLEMAN REPORT AND TWO PERTINENT BOOK REVIEWS ARE ALSO INCLUDED IN THIS BULLETIN. (LB)

05530

IRCD BULLETIN

PUBLICATION OF THE ERIC INFORMATION RETRIEVAL CENTER ON THE DISADVANTAGED

PROJECT BEACON - FERKAUF GRADUATE SCHOOL OF HUMANITIES AND SOCIAL SCIENCES - 55 FIFTH AVENUE, N.Y., N.Y. 10003

YESHIVA UNIVERSITY

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

Volume III, No. 5 **November 1967**

Equalizing Educational Opportunity in the Public School

Edmund W. Gordon, Ed.D.

Future historians may well conclude that the civil rights movement of the 1950's and 1960's had a more telling impact on public education than on any other single aspect of our society. Not only did this struggle contribute to a mid-twentieth century renaissance in education in the United States, as noted by former U.S. Commissioner of Education Keppel, but its concern with further democratizing education led also to the design and conduct of one of our most important pieces of educational research.

Section 402 of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 directed the Commissioner of Education to conduct a survey and report to the President and Congress on "the lack of availability of equal educational opportunities for individuals by reason of race, color, religion or national origin" in public educational institutions at all levels in the United States. The resulting report, *Equality of Educational Opportunity*, often referred to as the Coleman Report after its senior author and one of the nation's ablest research methodologists, is the most extensive survey of the U.S. public school in the entire history of the institution.

The Coleman Report, nevertheless, has received considerable criticism. Reviewers have commented on the absence of a theoretical basis for the study. Others have criticized problems in design, problems in sampling, and debatable approaches to data analysis. Some of the findings and conclusions of the survey, as well, have been at variance with assumptions that previously were widely held. Many of these problems and suggested weaknesses, no doubt, are due to the time limit imposed upon the study. Under requirement of the law, it was planned, designed, and conducted in two years. Additionally, within that same time period, data were analyzed and a final report prepared and published. But in spite of these suggested shortcomings, the fact is that the Coleman survey has produced some valuable data related to the general problem area of equality of educational opportunity. Indeed, there are findings from that report which most reviewers feel would stand tests of reanalysis or reinvestigation should the study be replicated or its data subjected to further analysis.

The four principal questions asked of the analysis of data in the Coleman Report and the findings related to each are summarized below:

1. *What is the extent of racial and ethnic group segregation in the public schools of the United States?* The great majority of children in this country attend schools in which most of the students are members of the same ethnic group. The assignment of children to schools by ethnic group identification is the dominant practice particularly in the South and, to a large extent, in the metropolitan North, Midwest, and West. "More than 65% of all Negro pupils in the first grade attend schools that are between 90 and 100% Negro. And 87% at grade one and 66% at grade 12, attend schools that are 50% or more Negro. In the South most students attend schools that are 100% white or Negro." A similar pattern of segregation is reported for teachers of Negro and white pupils.

2. *Are the schools attended by children in the United States equal in their facilities, programs, staff and pupil characteristics?* Negro children are likely to attend schools which are inferior to those attended by white children. The quality of schools attended, however, varies by region. "For the nation as a whole white children attend elementary schools with a smaller average number of pupils per room (29) than do any of the minorities (30 to 33) . . . In the non-metropolitan North and West and Southwest . . . there is a smaller average number of pupils per room for Negroes than for whites." But for secondary schools in the metropolitan Midwest, the average for Negroes is 54 pupils per room as compared with 33 per room for whites. "Nationally, at the high school level the average white has one teacher for every 22 students and the average Negro has one teacher for every 26 students." Nationally, Negro students also have fewer of the facilities which are thought to be most associated with academic achievement. "They have less access to physics, chemistry, and language laboratories. There are fewer books per pupil in their libraries. Their textbooks are less often in sufficient supply." Just as minority groups tend to have less access to physical facilities that seem to be related to academic achievement, they also have less access to curricular and extracurricular programs that would seem to have such a relationship. Negro high school students are less likely to attend schools that are regionally accredited. Negro and Puerto Rican students have less access to college preparatory programs and accelerated courses. Puerto Rican pupils have less access to vocational curriculums. Moreover, the average Negro pupil attends a school where the average teacher quality is inferior to that of the teacher of the average white child, where type of college, years of experience, salary, extent of travel, educational level of teacher's mother and teacher's vocabulary score are considered. Differences are also to be found in pupil characteristics. "The average Negro has fewer classmates whose mothers graduated from high school, his classmates tend to

EDMUND W. GORDON is Professor of Psychology and Education and Chairman of the Department of Educational Psychology and Guidance, Yeshiva University. He is also Director of ERIC–IRCD.

come from larger families, they are less often enrolled in college preparatory programs, and they have taken fewer courses in English, math, science and foreign language." Differences in school characteristics are considered to be small when considered in the context of national averages, however, for fuller appreciation, regional differences should also be considered. Coleman notes that "in cases where Negroes in the South receive unequal treatment, the significance in terms of actual numbers of individuals involved is very great, since 54% of the Negro population of school going age, or approximately 3,200,000 children, live in that region."

3. *What are the achievement patterns of children of different backgrounds as measured by their performance on achievement tests?* With the exception of pupils of Oriental family background, the average pupil from the minority groups studied scored distinctly lower at every level than the average white pupil. The minority group pupils' scores were as much as one standard deviation below the majority pupils' scores in the first grade. At the twelfth grade level, the scores of minority group pupils were even further below those of the majority group. Of additional significance is the fact that a constant difference in standard deviation over the various grades actually represents a mounting difference in grade level gap as the pupils move toward the twelfth grade. Consequently, schools seem to do little about an initial deficit which only increases as the minority pupils continue in school.

4. *What relationships exist between pupil academic achievement and characteristics of the schools they attend?* When differences in socioeconomic background factors for pupils are statistically controlled, differences between schools account for only a small fraction of differences in academic achievement. "The schools do differ, however, in their relation to the various racial and ethnic groups." White pupils seem to be less affected by the quality of their schools than minority group pupils. "The achievement of minority pupils depends more on the schools they attend than does the achievement of majority pupils." In the South, for example, 40 percent more of the achievement of Negro pupils is associated with the particular schools they attend than is the achievement of white pupils. With the exception of children from Oriental family backgrounds, this general result is true for all minority groups. Coleman suggests that **this finding "indicates that it is for the most disadvantaged children that improvements in school quality will make the most difference in achievement."** Although the relationship between school characteristics and pupil achievement is relatively modest, several of the characteristics on which predominantly Negro schools score low are among those which are related to pupil achievement. The existence of science laboratories in schools, for example, shows a small but consistent relationship to achievement—Negroes attend schools with fewer of these facilities. Teacher quality shows an even stronger relationship to pupil achievement, and it increases with grade level. Additionally, its impact on achievement is greater for Negroes than for whites. On measures of verbal skill and educational background, two relatively potent teacher variables, teachers of minority group pupils scored lower than teachers of majority group pupils. Educational background and aspirations of fellow students are also strongly related to pupil achievement. This relationship is less significant for white pupils than for Negro pupils. Coleman found educational backgrounds and aspirations to be lower among pupils in schools Negroes attend than in schools where whites are in the majority. In addition to the school characteristics which were shown to be related to pupil achievement, Coleman found a pupil characteristic which appears to have a stronger relationship to achievement than all the school factors combined. **The extent to which a pupil feels that he has control over his own destiny is strongly related to achievement.** This feeling of potency is less prevalent among Negro students, but where it is present, "their achievement is higher than that of white pupils who lack that conviction." Coleman reports that "while this characteristic shows little relationship to most school factors, it is related for Negroes to the proportion of whites in the schools. Those Negroes in schools with a higher proportion of whites have a greater sense of control."

In trying to draw implications from these findings, it is important to consider that Coleman has produced summary statistics which describe certain conditions and correlational statistics which, in turn, describe relationships which may be causal or simply coincidental. Causation certainly cannot be inferred from the strength of the relationships reported. When combined with the problems some critics see in the study, we are advised to move with caution in using the Coleman findings to determine public policy. Such caution, however, need not preclude serious thought and considered action. As the major findings of the study are reviewed, empirical experience, logic, and facts provide a context in which Coleman's conclusions may be interpreted.

There are some findings which common sense and clear observation leave us no choice but to accept. **Public schools in the United States are segregated by ethnic group and socioeconomic status. Negro children are more likely to attend schools of poorer quality than white children. Academic achievement for minority group children** (except Orientals) **is inferior to that of majority group children.** There simply is no question that these findings correspond to reality as we have experienced it; in the area of relationships between factors, nevertheless, there may be room for debate.

It seems clear, however, that for the development of the young person who comes to school without the advantage of being raised in a privileged or economically and socially secure white family what happens in the school is of great importance. The quality of his school's curriculum, the quality of his teachers, and the background of his fellow pupils are importantly related to the quality of his academic achievement. Additionally, his experience in the educational setting appears to influence his sense of power to control his destiny. As pointed out before, this attitudinal factor, even more than all school factors combined, has a significant relationship to quality of achievement and rate of development.

Now, in a sense, whether or not one wants to accept these conclusions and act upon them is not in question. The fact is that the political realities of the present period strongly reflect sensitivity to these conclusions. Indeed, the primary political struggles in public education today have to do with economic and ethnic integration and with improved quality of education as the prime vehicles for equalizing educational opportunity. Even the current demand for "black" schools and "black" control of schools for "black" children is but an expression of this struggle. The recently accelerated unionization of teachers and their efforts to improve salaries, working conditions, professional status, and quality of education are another part of the same struggle. It is only unfortunate that these two expressions have not always moved in concert.

A major strategic error in the recent strike in New York City was the teachers' failure to make adequate provisions for the education of poor children during the period of the

strike. If Coleman is right about the contribution of school factors to minority pupil achievement and given the modest use of the public school by more privileged families in New York City, the teachers were really striking against working class, Negro, Puerto Rican, and poor children. Important and necessary as this strike may have been, this was the effect without the advantage of providing any major inconvenience to the city's power structure and the upper classes as was true in the New York City transit strike when employers were deprived of workers who depended on public transportation. Surely, it is to the credit of the statesmen and more tolerant in the Negro community that the historic ties between the Negro community and labor unions were not ruptured and that we are not now faced with a sharper cleavage between teachers and the spokesmen of the "black" community who deeply resented the unavailability of teachers to carry on even the concededly inadequate educational services the schools provide. The "black" community did not need Coleman to tell them that what happens in school can be important in the development of their children. This they knew, and they have come to expect much from the school.

The contradictions involved in the expectations of the "black" community for the schools and the schools' obviously low performance in the achievement of academic mastery in minority group children bring into focus the central problem in the Coleman study. The public school was created for the purpose of making certain levels of achievement independent of social origin. Its historic mission has been to enable youngsters whose families could not adequately provide for their private education to acquire the knowledge and skill necessary for full participation in a democratic society. Coleman asked of his data whether or not the schools do this equally well for children from all segments of the population and found the answer to be no. He also asked if the schools' treatment of children from minority backgrounds is equal and found the answer to be no. The inappropriateness of this second question became clearer when he asked why the inequality existed.

When Coleman attempted to establish relationships between factors which help us understand why we do not do equally well with children from a variety of backgrounds, he found that **what children come to school with accounts for more of the variation in their achievement than any other factor.** Now, if this is true, it suggests that schools should not be providing equal treatment to all children but that treatment should, in fact, be unequal. The schools need to design their programs to meet the special characteristics and needs of the many kinds of children served; and, if a democratizing function is to be adequately served, these special programs must be designed to eventually bring all children to, at least, some common achievement goals. The schools are not doing this, and, furthermore, Coleman did not design his study to get at the dimensions of this aspect of the problem.

School factors may have been found to be of relatively modest importance for all pupils not because what the schools can do is not crucial but because Coleman did not look at what the schools actually do. He looked at static and status variables; he did not look at process variables. Variations in facilities, offerings, and teacher qualifications may be of less importance than pupil-teacher interaction, teacher expectation, classroom climate, pupil-pupil interaction, and the types and demands of the learning experiences available. Within the context of static and status variables, the dimensions studied may be too narrow to pick up the differences. Variations in class size between 26 and 36 may be unimportant. Differences between 18 and 36 may be highly significant. Although information was collected from administrators concerning their schools, the nature and quality of school administration was not evaluated. Differences in administrative styles and relationships and school climate resulting from such differences were not identified in the study. Coleman's study did not treat school factors sensitively; rather it approached them with crude measures that identified gross and not subtle differences.

When the gross nature of the study is combined with the fact that tradition did not lead Coleman to study the extent to which special pupil characteristics were reflected in the adequacy or the inadequacy of the schools' offerings, it is clear that important as this report is it only begins to suggest the magnitude of the problem. Educational opportunity in the United States is not equal, but it is even more unequal than this landmark study indicates.

The Coleman survey, nevertheless, does provide some leads as to what may be required to make educational opportunity and achievement more equal. **An important step toward providing for equality of educational opportunity would be economic or social class integration. Additional data from the Coleman Report and some reanalyses reported in** *Racial Isolation in the Public Schools* **also indicate that ethnic group integration will be an essential step in this process.** Even if racial integration in the schools is not essential in and of itself, it will be required in the achievement of social class integration since the Negro middle class is not large enough to provide an appropriate mix. Significantly, the pool of middle-class Negro children is reduced by the fact that in some areas better than one-fourth of these children are in institutions other than the public school. Despite the general conclusion that school factors are relatively unimportant as determinants of achievement in the total school population, Coleman's data also seem to to indicate that enriched curriculums, improved teacher quality, and other improvements in the schools which Negro students attend should make for increased achievement of poor and Negro children.

A program feature which emerges from the study, as well as from other sources, has to do with school organization. Just as Coleman omitted sensitive examination of dynamic aspects of school administration, he also did not look at patterns of parent and community participation in school policy making. It would not be unreasonable, however, to conclude that the important "locus of control" or "control over one's destiny" variable would be influenced by the child's perception of such power or influence in his parents or the adults in the group with which he identifies. The tradition in school administration of discouraging lay people, particularly poor or minority lay people, from participating in the determination of school policy will need to be sharply modified. These parents and community spokesmen may be a hidden resource which the depressed area schools have used inappropriately or not at all. Coleman reminds us that we were wrong about the educational aspirations and interests of minority groups. It also appears that we may have been wrong in excluding them from any meaningful voice in the direction of the schools their children attend.

These beginning efforts at equalizing educational opportunity will certainly not be adequate to the task. What is needed to make educational opportunity and achievement equal for all groups in our population must be the subject of extensive action and research programs. The Coleman study is a beginning, and from it flow many questions which should engage the attention of research investigators and social activists as well.

A Bibliography on the Coleman Report

The following is a bibliography related to the Coleman Report, COLEMAN, JAMES S.; and OTHERS. **Equality of educational opportunity.** Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1966. 737p. Included are selected reviews and reactions to the Coleman Report and two extensive bibliographies which point to broader references relevant to the subject under discussion. These references do not include several papers presented at recent professional meetings since the documents have not yet been made available to ERIC–IRCD.

ERIC–IRCD is introducing a coding system to assist the reader in gaining access to documents cited in bibliographies. No special notation will be made for articles appearing in regularly published journals, which are readily available to most subscribers in university and other libraries. The relevant code letters which will be placed at the end of each of the remaining appropriate citations are as follows:

C the document is in the ERIC–IRCD collection;

D doctoral dissertations for which microfilm copy is available through University Microfilms;

E the document is available on microfiche cards produced by ERIC, which may be secured through Bell and Howell and may be found in repositories throughout the country, including ERIC clearinghouses; and

X the document is in the ERIC–IRCD collection and will be xeroxed upon request.

Reviews and Reactions

ALBERT, ILENE; and SHELDON, PAMELA. **Equality of educational opportunity.** Educational Leadership, 24:281-287, December 1966. **X**

This review cites the major findings of the Coleman Report. It raises questions that are left unanswered by the report and points out instances where conclusions are drawn from insufficient evidence.

BOWLES, SAMUEL; and LEVIN, HENRY. **Equality of educational equality—a critical appraisal.** 1967, unpublished. (Authors' affiliations: Harvard University and Brookings Institution.)

A rigorous examination of the Coleman Report in which the design of the study and some of its analyses are criticized. The authors are particularly concerned that policy decisions not be based upon this preliminary study of so critical an area.

COLEMAN, JAMES S. **Equal schools or equal students?** The Public Interest, 70-75, Summer 1966. **X**

The principal author of **Equality of Educational Opportunity** *emphasizes the fact that the real need is for equally effective schools not equal school facilities. Included is what the author terms " a modest, yet radical proposal."*

DENTLER, ROBERT A. **Equality of educational opportunity—a special review.** Urban Review, 1:27-29, December 1966. **X**

Questions that were adequately answered in the Coleman Report are indicated and areas that might be given strong consideration in future research are suggested. The major conclusion is that the report made an outstanding contribution to the study of American intergroup relations.

JENCKS, CHRISTOPHER. **Education: the racial gap; finds of James Coleman's study.** New Republic, 155:21-26, October 1, 1966. **X**

The report is praised because it sought to study how school characteristics can affect the individual learner. Findings and conclusions of the report are discussed. The conclusion is that Federal intervention is needed to provide equality of educational opportunity.

NICHOLS, ROBERT C. **Schools and the disadvantaged.** Science, 154:1312-1314, December 9, 1966. **X**

The background and findings of the Coleman Report are discussed. Two areas of critical comment concern analysis of data regarding the effects of desegregation on Negro achievement and analysis of data regarding differences in educational opportunity.

U. S. COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS. **Racial isolation in the public schools.** Washington, D. C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1967. (Volumes I and II.) **E** (in process.)

The major finding of this report is that racial isolation, regardless of its source, is harmful to Negro pupils. The Commission states its concern that compensatory programs in racially isolated situations have not proven successful. Recommendations are presented.

The following papers were presented at the American Psychological Association Division 15 Symposium on Implications of Coleman Report on Equality of Educational Opportunity, September 3, 1967. The papers are presently being prepared for publication.

PETTIGREW, THOMAS. **Race and equal educational opportunity.** (Author's affiliation: Harvard University.)

DYER, HENRY S. **School factors, peer influence, and equal educational opportunity.** (Author's affiliation: Educational Testing Service.)

KATZ, IRWIN. **Motivation and equal educational opportunity.** (Author's affiliation: University of Michigan.)

GORDON, EDMUND W. **Family, environment, and equal educational opportunity.** (Author's affiliation: Yeshiva University.)

Bibliographies

ST. JOHN, NANCY; and SMITH, NANCY, eds. **Annotated bibliography on school racial mix and the self concept, aspirations, academic achievement and interracial attitudes and behavior of Negro children.** Cambridge: Center for Research and Development on Educational Differences, Harvard University, 1967. 251 ref. (Monograph No. 3.) **E** (In process.)

A selective bibliography which concentrates on the "effect on children of racial segregation, desegregation and integration in schools." It includes reports and reviews of empirical research, studies of Northern de facto segregation, research with Negro subjects, social and economic class and school variables.

WEINBERG, MEYER, ed. **School integration: a comprehensive classified bibliography of 3,100 references.** Chicago: Integrated Education Associates, 1967. **E** (In process.)

This compilation is based on the entries in the twenty-eight issues of the **Integrated Education** *magazine published since January 1963. There are sixteen sections, a few of which are historical, effects on children, community, law and government, role of the church, Spanish-Americans, American-Indians, and foreign. Not annotated.*

The Testing of Negro Intelligence

Although the chapter headings are identical, with the exception of a briefer chapter on "Veterans and Other Civilians," the scope of Shuey's 1966 revised edition of *The Testing of Negro Intelligence* has been enlarged from the 1958 document by the inclusion of several additional studies. The empirical picture, nevertheless, that emerges from the book is essentially unchanged.

The additional studies simply give more emphasis to data showing that, on the average, American Negroes consistently tend to score below whites and other racial groups on standardized tests. To further reinforce this emphasis, the sample of older children indicates greater racial divergence than the younger groups. Shuey's data show that Negroes appear to do relatively better on the "practical and concrete," and more poorly in "logical analysis, abstract reasoning, and certain perceptual-motor functions." Shuey's global analysis suggests the rank order of measured intelligence from the lowest to the highest to be 1, Southern Negroes; 2, Northern Negroes; 3, Southern whites; and, 4, Northern whites.

This reviewer finds himself in agreement with some criticisms expressed by Dreger in *Contemporary Psychology* (12:49-51, February 1967). Clearly, this book does not eliminate the continuing concern relevant to psychological comparisons in much socio-psychological research. Significantly, "race" is not adequately defined as a research variable; comparisons are often made between groups not genetically but primarily sociologically distinguished as "races"; and caste variables are not eliminated by socioeconomic matching. The extent to which there is a functional role in the development of intelligence is not sufficiently explained, as in the relationship between abstract intelligence and the demands of life experience or the nature and extent of formal education. The average racial difference of 11 I.Q. points, identified by the author, is derived from two broadly overlapping distributions of individual scores. This reduces the real meaning which can be derived from these data.

Even in view of these criticisms, however, *The Testing of Negro Intelligence* remains the most complete compendium of research on intelligence testing of Negroes. In addition, it includes a comprehensive statement on the hereditarian position concerning racial differences of I.Q.

Irwin Katz, Ph.D.

THE TESTING OF NEGRO INTELLIGENCE, by Audrey M. Shuey, New York: Social Science Press, 1966.

IRWIN KATZ is Professor of Psychology at the University of Michigan and a member of the ERIC-IRCD Advisory Committee.

Education of the Disadvantaged

A. Harry Passow, Miriam Goldberg, and Abraham J. Tannenbaum, three professors of education at Columbia University's Teachers College, have compiled a volume of thirty-one articles reflecting "current thinking and, wherever possible, research on the educational problems of disadvantaged pupils." Prepared for use by a wide range of pre- and inservice school personnel, from administrators to paraprofessionals, the collection includes items on "The Nature and Setting of the Educational Problem," "Disadvantaged Minority Groups," "Socio-Psychological Factors Affecting School Achievement," and "Teachers for the Disadvantaged."

Selections range from research reports to scantily evaluated program descriptions. Scholarly articles by such experimenters as J. McVicker Hunt, Basil Bernstein, and Irwin Katz coexist with some rather speculative discussions and some promising, even inspiring, program descriptions which, in some cases, scarcely state their theoretical bases and lack careful evaluation. Midway between these extremes are works which attempt to elicit from research some sound guidelines for action. Among these are David Ausubel's piece on the reversibility of cognitive and motivational effects of cultural deprivation and several articles by Miriam Goldberg.

Although the editors appear to accept the prevailing explanations of the learning deficits of the disadvantaged, they have provided the reader with selections which challenge these and other current assumptions. Articles by Fred Strodtbeck and Dan Dodson focus on the issue of power—the former dealing with power relationships in the family and the latter with power in the community. While Dodson decries the emphasis on children's deficiencies, Strodtbeck posits a somewhat different explanation of them. He hypothesizes that the "hidden curriculum" of the middle-class family, its power relationships which stimulate the development of complex language and thought processes, is the basic educational deprivation of the lower-class child.

Articles by Alan Wilson and Joseph Justman offer findings which qualify some assumptions about the disadvantaged. Wilson's work, a powerful argument for school integration along social class lines, suggests that educational aspirations are influenced not only by family variables but by socioeconomic milieu of the school attended. In a study of thir-

EDUCATION OF THE DISADVANTAGED, edited by A. Harry Passow, Miriam Goldberg, and Abraham J. Tannenbaum, New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1967. 503p.

GERTRUDE S. GOLDBERG is a Research Associate of ERIC–IRCD.

Publications Available

Four special state-of-the-art or review papers are available for distribution through ERIC–IRCD. Commissioned and published by the clearinghouse in response to emerging needs, these papers are channeled into the national ERIC system and can be obtained on microfiche and in hard copy. Now available are:

Health and the Education of Socially Disadvantaged Children, by Herbert G. Birch, M.D., Ph.D. (Albert Einstein College of Medicine);

Job and Career Development for the Poor — The Human Services, by Gertrude S. Goldberg, M.S. (Yeshiva University);

Learning Patterns in the Disadvantaged, by Susan S. Stodolsky, Ph.D. and Gerald S. Lesser, Ph.D. (Harvard University); and

Problems and Directions for Research on Public School Desegregation, by Irwin Katz, Ph.D. (University of Michigan).

For persons interested, a complete set of back issues of the *IRCD BULLETIN* can be obtained at a cost of $1.50. All remittances should be made payable to Yeshiva University — Attention: Mrs. Evelyn L. Abramson, ERIC–IRCD.

teen high schools in the San Francisco–Oakland Bay area, he found that the sons of manual workers are more likely to have high educational aspirations if they attend predominantly middle-class schools and, conversely, that the aspirations of the sons of professionals are lower if they attend predominantly working-class schools. Justman offers some evidence to modify the widely promulgated assertion that achievement and aptitude scores of disadvantaged children decline with years of schooling—at least between the third and sixth grades. He found that if data are controlled for the variable of mobility, New York City slum children who attended only one school showed higher reading and academic aptitude test scores in the sixth than in the third grades, whereas their counterparts with multiple school admissions showed declines over that period.

The quality of any collection of readings depends partly on availability and partly on the editors' discernment. Probably this collection suffers more from the shortcomings of the field than of the editors who, after all, purported only to reflect "current thinking." If there is a dearth of carefully designed and evaluated programs for the disadvantaged, Passow, Goldberg, and Tannenbaum can hardly be blamed for selecting articles which fail to meet these standards. And if our knowledge ignores the heterogeneity of learning patterns among the disadvantaged or, as Edmund Gordon has observed, the precise meaning of observed behaviors to the individual child in the teaching-learning situation, then one cannot expect this volume to overcome such gaps.

Furthermore, if the field has concentrated on the Negro poor, despite the fact that there are many more white than "nonwhite" children living in poverty, then the tendency for some articles to confuse the Negro with "the socially disadvantaged" mirrors the status of our field. Indeed, the editors attempt to overcome this tendency by including articles on migrant children and on American Indians as well as some in which there are sections dealing with Puerto Ricans and Mexican Americans.

Although these somewhat unavoidable weaknesses appear to have been recognized by the editors, there are a few instances in which they either settled for less good materials than they might have or should have omitted what was available. It is appropriate to refer to the "strengths of the inner-city child," but the article's usefulness is reduced by Eisenberg's failure to specify what disadvantaged groups his generalizations refer to or the basis for his statements. Finally, analyses of the problems of socially disadvantaged urban Negroes might have alluded to the current work of such scholars as Charles Killingsworth, Hylan Lewis, and Karl and Alma Taeuber. Instead, the volume opens with Charles Silberman's 1962 piece from *Fortune Magazine*, "The City and the Negro." It is 1967, and facile phrases like "the environmental and cultural curtain that keeps *the* Negro child from learning," (italics mine) are no longer—if they ever were—useful.

Gertrude S. Goldberg, M.S.

The IRCD BULLETIN is a bi-monthly publication of the ERIC Information Retrieval Center on the Disadvantaged. It is published five times a year and usually includes status or interpretive statements, book reviews, and a selected bibliography on some aspect of the center's special areas. Subject areas covered by IRCD include the effects of disadvantaged environments; the academic, intellectual, and social performance of disadvantaged children and youth; programs and practices which provide learning experiences designed to compensate for the special problems and build on the characteristics of the disadvantaged; and programs and practices related to economic and ethnic discrimination, segregation, desegregation, and integration in education.

The center is operated under a contract with the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) of the U. S. Office of Education and receives additional funds from the College Entrance Examination Board, Yeshiva University, and other agencies for special services.

As a specialized clearinghouse on socially, economically, and culturally disadvantaged urban children and youth, ERIC–IRCD gathers and evaluates materials, particularly unpublished documents, and places those of sufficient value into a national information system. The publication, *Research in Education*, distributed by the Government Printing Office, announces these materials to the public. ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS) distributes them in microfiche form.

GPO 957-873

Edmund W. Gordon
Director

Robert W. Butler
Associate Director
Operations

Adelaide Jablonsky
Associate Director
Content

ERIC–IRCD BULLETIN

Edmund W. Gordon — Editor

Ferkauf Graduate School of
Humanities and Social Sciences
Yeshiva University
55 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y. 10003
(212) 255-5600

Non-Profit Org.
U. S. Postage
PAID
New York, N. Y.
Permit No. 1920

THIRD CLASS
RETURN REQUESTED